

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated April 23, 2004, claims 1, 4, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18 and 19 have been amended. Claims 1-20 remain in the case. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 7 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Motai (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,220).

The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the amendments to the claims that more clearly defines the Applicants' invention and the arguments below.

Namely, claims 1, 11 and 17 recite in part "...enabling remote input access to the original, updatable schedule, as additional schedule and contact inputs for creating an amended schedule and a matrix with a time contact schedule that includes current time sensitive contact information..." Next, claims 4, 16 and 18 recite in part "...enabling remote input access to the original, updatable schedule, as additional schedule and contact inputs for creating an amended schedule and a matrix with a time contact schedule that includes current time sensitive contact information to provide accessors of the computer device with current contact information of a user of the computer device..." In addition, claims 10 and 19 recite in part "...enabling remote input access to the original, updatable schedule, as additional schedule and contact inputs for creating an amended schedule and a matrix with a time contact schedule that includes current time sensitive contact information with plural and alternative contact methods during certain time periods of the matrix of a user of the computer device..."

In contrast, Motai does not disclose all of the Applicant's features of each of the claims. Although Motai discloses "[A]n image display apparatus...which a graphic image...and a calendar are displayed on a display unit...", Motai clearly does not disclose the Applicant's claimed "...enabling remote...contact inputs for creating an amended schedule and a matrix with a time contact schedule that includes current time sensitive contact information..." Accordingly, since the Motai reference is missing at least one element of the claimed invention, it cannot anticipate the claims. As such, the

Applicants respectfully submit that these rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) should be withdrawn.

Next, the Office Action rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Motai. Also, the Office Action rejected claims 5-6, 8-16 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Motai in view of Davis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,937,160).

The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections based on the amendments to the claims and the arguments above and below.

As discussed above, among other things, none of cited references, in combination or alone, disclose the Applicant's claimed "...enabling remote...contact inputs for creating an amended schedule and a matrix with a time contact schedule that includes current time sensitive contact information..." In addition, although Davis et al. disclose a system "...for automatically revising a hypertext document stored within a server connected to a computer network via an e-mail message...", the combination of Davis et al. with Motai is missing elements of the Applicant's claimed invention.

Specifically, the cited references, in combination or alone, are missing the Applicant's claimed "...enabling remote...contact inputs for creating...a matrix...to provide accessors of the computer device with current contact information of a user of the computer device..." In addition, the combination of Davis et al. with Motai is missing the Applicant's claimed "...enabling remote...contact inputs for creating...a matrix...with plural and alternative contact methods during certain time periods of the matrix..." Therefore, since the cited references, in combination or alone, are missing at least one element of the Applicant's claimed invention, they cannot render the claims obvious and the Applicant submits that these rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Last, with regard to the dependent claims, because they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, and they contain additional limitations that are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, these claims are also considered to be patentable (MPEP § 2143.03).

Thus, it is respectfully requested that all of the claims be allowed based on the amendments and arguments. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicants kindly invite the Examiner to **telephone** the Applicants' attorney at **(818) 885-1575** if the Examiner has any questions or concerns. Please note that all correspondence should continue to be directed to:

Hewlett Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,
Dated: July 23, 2004



Edmond A. DeFrank
Reg. No. 37,814
Attorney for Applicants
(818) 885-1575 TEL
(818) 885-5750 FAX